DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 125 696 JC 760 371

TITLE Community and Junior College Instruction: Texas, 1975-76. The Fifth Annual Report to the Texas Association of Junior College Instructional Administrators by the Research Committee.

INSTITUTION Texas Association of Junior Coll. Instructional Administrators.

PUB DATE 14 Jun 76

NOTE 47p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; College Deans; Community Colleges; Consortia; *Effective Teaching; *Inservice Teacher Education; *Intercollegiate Programs; *Junior Colleges; Predictor Variables; Rural Schools; *Tax Support

IDENTIFIERS Flanders Interaction Analysis; *Texas

ABSTRACT

This document contains six papers. The first paper discusses the creation and operation of the Gulf Coast Intercollegiate Conference, a six-college consortium designed to promote competitions, festivals, and other forms of academic and recreational interaction for the students of the member institutions. The second paper reports the results of a study designed to identify the role of deans of instruction in small rural junior colleges in implementing faculty growth and development. The third paper presents a summary of a Delphi-technique study conducted to evaluate the effectiveness of selected inservice training techniques, including microteaching and Flanders Interaction Analysis. The fourth paper discusses the use of life change and reading achievement as predictors of the academic success of community college freshmen. The fifth paper discusses the impact of local tax support (or lack of it) on the caliber of district programs and services, characteristics of district physical plant, community support, and prospects for district status in the next decade. The final paper reports on a study designed to assess the attitudes of academic and vocational/technical faculty members and administrators on the competencies needed for successful junior/community college teaching. (DC)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED125696

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

the	THE
fifth	FIFTH
annual	ANNUAL
report	REPORT
of	OF
the	THE
research	RESEARCH
committee	COMMITTEE
texas	TEXAS
association	ASSOCIATION
of	OF
junior	JUNIOR
college	COLLEGE
instructional	INSTRUCTIONAL
administrators	ADMINISTRATORS
june 14,	JUNE 14,
1976	1976

JC 760 371

COMMUNITY AND JUNIOR COLLEGE INSTRUCTION:

TEXAS, 1975-76

THE

FIFTH ANNUAL REPORT

TO

THE TEXAS ASSOCIATION

OF

JUNIOR COLLEGE INSTRUCTIONAL ADMINISTRATORS

BY

THE RESEARCH COMMITTEE

June 14-15, 1976

RESEARCH COMMITTEE TOPICS OF EMPHASIS

Applying the Delphi technique to the committee's goals from last year and additional areas of concern expressed by members of the T.A.J.C.I.A. this year, the ten topics which follow emerged as topics of emphasis for 1976-77. The consensus of the committee was that these areas should be stressed, while at the same time encouraging the sharing of studies and papers dealing with other issues pertinent to community college instruction.

- comparative effectiveness of varied teaching strategies
- faculty load equivalencies
- evaluation of remedial, basic, or developmental studies
- continuous enrollment-continuous progress programs
- faculty morale assessment
- collective bargaining
- inservice training
- management training for instructional administrators
- evaluation of off-campus programs
- models for staff evaluation; relationship to morale and accountability

Persons who are aware of materials relative to the above or other subjects which would be of interest and assistance to junior/community college instructional administrators are encouraged to forward a copy to the chairman of the Research Committee. Sources might include:

- abstracts of theses and dissertations completed 1973-76
- research reports, bibliographies, reviews of literature, and position papers prepared by Texas college and university faculty members
- short research papers prepared by graduate students, 1973-76
- special and routine reports prepared by the Coordinating Board, Texas Education Agency, and Texas Junior College Teacher's Association
- special and routine reports prepared by ACT, ETS, ACE, others
- reprints of articles which have appeared in professional journals

PREFACE

The Texas Association of Junior College Instructional Administrators was formed at the annual junior college convention in February 1969 and has been an active organization since that time. The membership of the organization is composed of the instructional administrators of the junior colleges of the state.

At the October 1970 meeting of T.A.J.C.I.A., Dr. James Reynolds of the University of Texas at Austin proposed establishment of a standing Research Committee composed of junior college instructional administrators and university professors who conduct or supervise research related to junior college instruction for the purpose of coordinating research needs with research expertise. The committee has met regularly since that date and this report contains abstracts of research into current problems identified by junior college personnel.

Additional reports will be presented at the annual summer meeting of the association in Corpus Christi, June 13-15, 1976.

MEMBERSHIP

Our appreciation goes to these persons who have served on the Research Committee for 1975-76:

1975-76 Research Committee

Dr. Gene Atkinson, Professor of Education and Assistant Dean of Faculties
College of Education, University of Houston

Glen I. Bounds, Dean of Instruction
Mountain View College

Dr. Raymond E. Cleveland, Associate Professor of Higher Education
Department of Educational Administration, Texas A & M University

Beryl D. Clinton, Dean
Clarendon College

Dr. Dewey Davis, Professor
College of Multi-disciplinary Studies
The University of Texas at San Antonio

Dr. Kenneth H. Freeman, Professor Director
Junior College Center for Professional Development
Texas Technological University

Dr. R. B. Golemon, Academic Dean
Ranger Junior College

Dr. James Harding, Dean of Academic Education
Houston Community College

Dr. Henry McCullough, Dean
Angelina College

Dr. Bob W. Miller, Director of Community College Programs
North Texas State University

Dr. John B. Murphy, Dean of the College
St. Phillips College

Dr. James W. Reynolds, Professor of Curriculum and Instruction
University of Texas at Austin

Dr. Milton L. Smith, Associate Professor & Director of Junior College Programs
Southwest Texas State University

Dr. Arthur Southerland, Dean of Instructional Administration
Eastfield College

Dr. Sheila C. Tesar, Assistant Director, Community College Programs Division
Coordinating Board

1975-76 Research Committee , Cont'd.

Dr. James W. Tunnell, Associate Professor and Director
Center for Community College Education
East Texas State University

Dr. Jerald Underwood, Dean of the College
Southwest Texas State College

George E. Thomas, Associate Dean for Academic Programs
College of Mainland
Chairman, Research Committee

1976-77 Research Committee

Dr. Gene Atkinson, Professor of Education and Assistant Dean of Faculties
College of Education, University of Houston

Dr. R. Eugene Byrd, Dean of Arts and Sciences
Amarillo College

Dr. Stanton Calvert, Director of Community College Programs
Coordinating Board

Dr. Dewey Davis, Professor
College of Multi-disciplinary Studies
The University of Texas at San Antonio

Dr. Kenneth H. Freeman, Professor Director
Junior College Center for Professional Development
Texas Technological University

Dr. R. B. Golemon, Academic Dean
Ranger Junior College

Levi H. Hall, Dean of Faculty
Texarkana Community College

Dr. Glenn R. Johnson, Professor in Higher Education
The Department of Educational Curriculum & Instruction
Texas A & M University

Dr. Henry McCullough, Dean
Angelina College

Dr. Bob W. Miller, Director of Community College Programs
North Texas State University

Dr. John B. Murphy, Dean of the College
St. Phillips College

Dr. James W. Reynolds, Professor of Curriculum & Instruction
University of Texas at Austin

Dr. Milton L. Smith, Associate Professor & Director of Junior College Programs
Southwest Texas State University

Dr. James W. Tunnell, Associate Professor & Director
Center for Community College Education
East Texas State University

Dr. Jerald Underwood, Dean of the College
Southwest Texas Junior College

Dr. Arthur R. Southerland, Dean of Instructional Administration
Eastfield College
Chairman, Research Committee

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Research Committee Topics of Emphasis ---------- ii

Preface ---------- iii

Research Committee Membership ---------- iv

GCIC -- A Consortium for Student Interaction ---------- 1
Robert C. Cloud
Ron Ummel

A Critical Analysis of the Role Perception of the Dean of Instruction in Faculty Development in Four Rural Junior Colleges in Texas ---------- 5
Robert Bruce Goleman

Use of the Delphi Process to Evaluate the Effectiveness of Selected In-Service Training Techniques to Improve Junior/Community College Instruction ---------- 8
Glenn R. Johnson

Life Change and Reading Achievement as Predictors of Academic Performance for Selected Community College Freshmen ------- 14
Kay Fields Henard

Local Tax Authorization and Community College Status: A Study of Adaptation ---------- 31
Roy Conrado Rodriguez

Competencies for Junior/Community College Teachers --------- 34
Sheila C. Tesar

GCIC - A CONSORTIUM FOR STUDENT INTERACTION

by ROBERT C. CLOUD and RON UMMEL

A recent and significant innovative form in the community colleges is the consortium. Community colleges have found the consortium to be an effective method of attacking problems common to all members because this arrangement provides a formal structure for interaction, enabling participants to undertake collectively what is beyond their capacity individually. Sometimes called conferences, federations, or associations, consortia have been increasing in number recently, and it appears that this trend will continue. The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, in its October, 1973, report, recommended "continued development and strengthening of consortia in higher education" because of the significant economies which can be achieved through consortium arrangements and other forms of institutional cooperation.

The possibility of increased funding has been a primary motivator for the creation of consortia, because these arrangements have proven to be convenient catchments for federal and private funds. In addition to the economic considerations, other objectives can be achieved through a consortium arrangement, some of these being program development, faculty and staff development, and expanded student services. Recently, a community college consortium, the Gulf Coast Intercollegiate Conference, was organized in southeast Texas to provide for an expanded program of student activities in member institutions. The purpose of this manuscript is to share information about the GCIC with community college administrators and faculty who may have an interest in such topics.

In January, 1969, administrators from five gulf coast community colleges met to discuss ways to involve students in a broad range of activities related to their major areas of study and recreational interests. A primary goal of the group was to expose students to a variety of learning experiences that were supportive of but not restricted to the classroom and laboratory setting;

stated differently, the objective was to entice students "out of the box of conventional education" and into interactive relationships with students and faculty from their college and other institutions. From the outset, student socialization and participation were primary objectives, and it was agreed that the highly competitive spirit characterizing many collegiate conferences would not be emphasized in the GCIC.

Dr. Herbert Stallworth, first President of College of the Mainland, was a leader in the effort to develop the conference, and in a series of meetings held during the spring semester, 1969, a number of guidelines were developed relative to a broad program of conference activities. Using the guidelines as points of reference, presidents of the five colleges prepared a constitution and by-laws for the proposed conference. On May 8, 1969, both documents were approved by the original Board of Directors, and the conference became a reality, with activities beginning during the fall semester, 1969. The conference was entitled Gulf Coast Junior College Intercollegiate Conference, and original membership included Alvin Junior College, Brazosport College, College of the Mainland, Galveston College, and Lee College. Wharton Junior College was admitted as a member in June, 1972, by unanimous vote of the member colleges. The name of the conference was changed to Gulf Coast Intercollegiate Conference in March, 1975, by action of the Board of Directors.

The central purpose of the GCIC is to promote and encourage, at the lowest possible cost, amateur relationships, competitions, festivals, and other forms of interaction for students living in the service area of each member institution. Participation being a principal component of the educational process, conference activities focus on broad student involvement in a wide range of activities. Five divisions of interest have been established in order that the comprehensive purpose of the conference may be achieved, these being Physical Education and Athletics, Communications, Fine Arts, Natural Sciences and Engineering, and Occupational Education.

Conference members are encouraged to participate in all divisions, but each institution has the prerogative to decide in which divisions it will participate. Each division provides for its own organizational structure, such organization being reflected in its by-laws. Common denominators in all by-laws include the name of the division, purpose, dues, officers, meetings, and rules of participation.

Through its five divisions, the GCIC offers opportunity for participation in fine arts, debate, mathematics and engineering, natural sciences, physical education, and occupational education. Students with advanced physical skills may compete in basketball, baseball, tennis, and golf. In keeping with the concept of a low-cost program, a minimum number of scholarships are provided for student athletes, these awards being restricted by conference rules to coverage of tuition, fees, and books. In addition, member institutions recruit student athletes only from a twelve-county area encompassing all campuses in the conference.

The GCIC is governed by a Board of Directors composed of the presidents of member institutions, or their designees. Each member college is entitled to one vote in decisions rendered by the Board which meets annually in June to consider the business of the conference. Duties of the Board include long-range planning, approving new divisions and by-laws, regulating the activities program, promoting the fullest possible program of inter-institutional student activities, and administering the budget of the conference. The operating budget is approved in June, with the activities of the conference being financed totally from membership dues.

The GCIC has completed six years of service to students and faculty. The program has increased in scope steadily since its inception, with each year bringing an increase in the number of students served and activities offered. As one might expect, student participation has been greatest in the divisions of Physical Education and Athletics, Fine Arts, and Communications, perhaps because these areas lend themselves to the interaction and participation that are primary purposes of the conference. Recently, the

Fine Arts Division sponsored several programs of cultural exchange that were very favorably received; these included traveling student and faculty art exhibitions and traveling student recitals. The art exhibitions were displayed on each campus for two weeks, while the recitals were held on several dates during the spring semester. These activities and others will be sponsored again in the future. The Divisions of Natural Sciences and Engineering and Occupational Education are revamping their programs for the 1975-76 academic year in an effort to stimulate more student interest and involvement. Activities being planned include tours of the laboratory facilities of all member colleges by science majors, a workshop for engineering majors sponsored by area universities, a spring science fair and ecology day, and a conference on job opportunities sponsored by area business and industries.

In summary, student response to the GCIC has been gratifying to faculty members and administrators in the member colleges. Activities of the conference have attracted the attention of other colleges as evidenced by the fact that North Harris County College was accepted for membership beginning with the 1975-76 academic year. The GCIC has, indeed, become a vehicle for interaction and exchange among students and faculty in the Gulf Coast community colleges of Texas, and it can be said that the conference is alive and well and looking to the future with confidence.

Sources:

Constitution and By-laws and Divisional By-laws, Gulf Coast Junior College Intercollegiate Conference, 1970 and 1975 (revised).

Minutes of Meetings, Gulf Coast Junior College Intercollegiate Conference, 1969-1975.

Robert C. Cloud
Dean of Instruction
Lee College

Ron Ummel
Chairman
Department of Health and Physical Education
Lee College

A CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF THE ROLE PERCEPTION OF THE DEAN OF INSTRUCTION IN FACULTY DEVELOPMENT IN FOUR RURAL JUNIOR COLLEGES IN TEXAS

Publication No. _____

Robert Bruce Golemon, Ph. D.

The University of Texas at Austin, 1975

Supervising Professor: James W. Reynolds

Much has been written about the importance and necessity for continuing faculty development but there seems to be no study directed toward defining the role perception of the dean of instruction in small rural junior colleges. The problem is how to perceive the role the dean should take in implementing faculty growth and development within the budgetary and personnel limits imposed by local financial conditions. This study was designed to obtain administrative and faculty judgements regarding the value of procedures regarding the general structural characteristics of current institutional approaches to faculty development.

Information was obtained through a general questionnaire survey involving the faculty and the dean of instruction at four widely separated rural junior colleges in Texas. The deans were interviewed to obtain administrative judgements on the effectiveness of the activities for faculty development and four

large urban college deans of instruction were interviewed to determine if there were differences in role perception between the urban junior college deans and the deans of small rural junior colleges.

It was found that there were no differences of perception in the responsibilities, duties, or functions of the deans of instruction of small rural junior colleges in matters germane to faculty growth and development.

The faculty perception of the role of the dean of instruction in faculty development agreed with the perception of the dean on his role. Except for class visitation, there were no differences in the role choices.

There were no differences in role perception of the dean of instruction in a large urban junior college from the role perception of the dean of a small rural junior college. There was a difference in the degree of personal involvement. The urban dean delegated the operational aspects of faculty development to an assistant dean of instruction whereas this was an impossibility for the small rural junior college dean who attended to the actual developmental activities himself.

Concerning the community service of a junior college as an element in faculty development, the small rural junior college dean of instruction and his faculty felt obligated to do as much as possible in service to the community because of the absence of other institutions capable of delivering such services. The greatest handicap appeared to be the lack of adequate funds to perform all the services deemed necessary.

The deans of instruction perceived their role in faculty development as involving 1.) policy (graduate study, visiting other colleges, attending pro-

fessional meetings), 2.) practice (making available funds for travel, organizing workshops of in-service training, making consultants available, helping to develop local evaluation instruments, encouraging self-evaluation, discussing classroom procedures and methods of teaching, recognition of outstanding performance) and 3.) provision for growth (development of the sabbatical, encouraging travel and visitations, arranging and promoting teacher exchange programs, encouraging faculty writing, encouraging participation in social and service opportunities in the community). This role is intended to realize the purpose of the junior college by increasing the effectiveness and productivity of the faculty.

(Summary)

Use of the Delphi Process to Evaluate the Effectiveness of Selected In-service Training Techniques to Improve Junior/Community College Instruction

Dr. Glenn R. Johnson

Objectives

The participants in a summer institute established for junior/community college professors were used to collect data regarding the effectiveness of recommended teaching procedures.

Perspective

Drawing from the literature, teaching modalities and in-service training procedures purported to enhance teaching effectiveness were incorporated within the summer institute.

Methods and/or Techniques

Junior/community college professors from various Texas colleges and representing a number of different disciplines were selected to participate. A variety of selected techniques purported to enhance teaching effectiveness were incorporated within the institute.

Data Source

The Delphi technique, which specifies repeated measurement and controlled feedback, was used to collect data. A five point scale was incorporated with the instrument: 5 = very effective, 4 = effective, 3 = neither effective nor ineffective, 2 = ineffective, 1 = very ineffective.

The first round was computed on the first day of the institute; the second round was computed on the last day of the institute; and, the final round was computed near the close of the Fall Term after each participant returned to his respective college. For rounds two and three, each participant was informed of his old answer and the median of each technique as expressed by the total group of participants.

Results and/or Conclusions

Those techniques with a mean of 4.0 or higher at the end of the third round of the Delphi were: lecture with aides, demonstration, small group discussion, assigned reading, individual projects, behavioral objectives, seminars, reinforcement techniques, questioning strategies (e.g., probing, higher order questions), audio-tutoral programs, interaction analysis, and Taba's Cognitive Tasks. Although not included in the Delphi, microteaching was also identified at the close of the institute as quite effective in enhancing one's teaching ability (4.45 mean on the same scale used with the Delphi).

Concluding Statements

Follow-up visits were made to each participant's campus; and, the participant and his immediate supervisor were interviewed by the author. Feedback from both indicated the value of the above techniques and helped to substantiate the results of the Delphi. The value of actually having junior/community college professors use the various techniques in an institute setting also appeared worthwhile.

Use of the Delphi Process to Evaluate the Effectiveness of Selected In-service Training Techniques to Improve Junior/Community College Instruction

Dr. Glenn R. Johnson
Texas A&M University

Twenty-five instructors from eleven different Texas Junior/Community Colleges participated in a six weeks institute geared to improving teaching. The author directed the program which was offered at Texas A&M University. The major subject matter areas taught by the Junior/Community College instructors included history, biology, mathematics, English, sociology, industrial arts, psychology, music, business, zoology, speech/drama, and health and physical education. The participants had an average of 5.08 years of experience in teaching at the college level. One had an earned doctorate while the remaining twenty-four had at least a master's degree.

The Junior/Community College instructors received fifteen contact hours of skill training in Flanders Interaction Analysis (FIA). FIA is a ten category observation system developed by Dr. Ned A. Flanders and his associates so any verbal statement made in a classroom by an instructor or a student could be identified with one of the ten categories. A trained observer during each three second period of time decides which category best represents the verbal interaction taking place and writes down the numeral for that category while observing the next three second period of time. This results in a series of numerals being written in sequence and preserves the order in which the behavior occured. The ten categories of Flanders Interaction Analysis with a brief description of each appear on the next page.

If one accepts the idea that teaching involves at least to some extent the reciprocal communication between two or more people (one being referred to as the instructor), then FIA can be used to study one aspect of teacher variables (verbal interaction with students). There is some evidence that people trained to analyze this phase of instruction also change their own verbal behavior.[1]

Microteaching was another major activity for the Junior/Community College instructors. The participants engaged in microteaching experiences

---

[1] Interaction Analysis: Selected Papers, Washington, D.C.: Association of Teacher Educators and ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, ATE Research Bulletin No. 10, 1971.

SUMMARY OF FLANDERS' CATEGORIES FOR INTERACTION ANALYSIS

TEACHER TALK

INDIRECT INFLUENCE

1. * ACCEPTS FEELING: accepts and clarifies the feeling tone of the students in a nonthreatening manner. Feelings may be positive or negative. Predicting or recalling feelings is included.
2. * PRAISES OR ENCOURAGES: praises or encourages student action or behavior. Jokes that release tension, but not at the expense of another individual: nodding head, or saying "um hum?" or "go on" are included.
3. * ACCEPTS OR USES IDEAS OF STUDENTS: clarifying, building, or developing ideas suggested by a student. As teacher brings more of his own ideas into play, shift to Category 5.
4. * ASKS QUESTIONS: asking a question about content or procedure with the intent that a student answer.

DIRECT INFLUENCE

5. * LECTURING: giving facts or opinions about content or procedures; expressing his own ideas, asking rhetorical questions.
6. * GIVING DIRECTIONS: directions, commands, or orders with which a student is expected to comply.
7. * CRITICIZING OR JUSTIFYING AUTHORITY: statements intended to change student behavior from nonacceptable to acceptable pattern; bawling someone out; stating why the teacher is doing what he is doing; extreme self-reference.

STUDENT TALK

8. * STUDENT TALK-RESPONSE: talk by students in response to teacher. Teacher initiates the contact or solicits student statement.
9. * STUDENT TALK-INITIATION: talk by students, which they initiate. If "calling on" student is only to indicate who may talk next, observer must decide whether student wanted to talk. If he did, use this category.
10. * SILENCE OR CONFUSION: pauses, short periods of silence, and periods of confusion in which communication cannot be understood by the observer.

* There is NO scale implied by these numbers. Each number is classificatory; it designates a particular kind of communication event. To write these numbers down during observation is to enumerate--not to judge a position on a scale.

concentrating on skills of fluency in asking questions, reinforcement, probing questions, and various higher order questions. First, a videotaped protocol along with a typed script was presented to the participants for each of the skill areas. In the microteaching laboratory, each participant taught a lesson using his or her own subject specialty for content while focusing upon one of the specific skills; e.g., probing questions. Each lesson was videotaped, played back over a T.V. monitor, and critiqued for the participant.

The procedure for focusing on one technical teaching skill during micrioteaching has been quite successful according to various reports involving the practice.[2] These scaled-down lessons of five-to-ten minutes in length involving only three or four students inables the instructor to concentrate on a specific teaching skill away from the usual classroom setting where he normally confronts fifty to three hundred students. However, microteaching is not 'make believe': the professor really teaches, and the three or four students really learn. The lesson is short only because the teacher is required to focus on specific skills for analysis.

The amalgamation of microteaching and FIA as training techniques has been described by the author in a recent publication.[3]

The participants also learned about several other procedures that might improve their teaching effectiveness: audio-tutoral programs, multiple-choice test construction and test-item analysis, independent listening, assigned readings, behavioral objectives, brainstorming, buzz groups, small group discussions, and simulation.

The Delphi process which specifies repeated measurement and controlled feedback was incorporated into the education procedures. The first round of the survey was conducted on the opening day of the six weeks institute. The median recorded for each teaching technique was computed and on the last day of the institute the participants were informed of their old answer, the median for each technique, and provided another opportunity to express their opinions. These second round responses were again tabulated and the above procedure was repeated for the third round in November when the participants were back at their Junior/Community Colleges. The Likert scale for Delphi

---

[2] Microteaching: Definition and Overview, Washington, D.C.: PREP, National Center for Educational Communication, U.S. office of Education (undated).

[3] Johnson, Glenn R., Analyzing College Teaching, Manchaca, Texas: Sterling Swift Publishing Co., 1976, 76 pages.

process was: 5 = very effective, 4 = effective, 3 = neither effective nor ineffective, 2 = ineffective, 1 = very ineffective.

The most effective techniques identified by the participants for Junior/Community College settings via the Delphi technique (mean scores of 4.0 or higher) included the following: lecture with visual aides, demonstrations, small group discussions, seminars, assigned readings, individual projects, behavioral objectives, reinforcement, various questioning strategies, audio-tutorial units, interaction analysis, and cognitive tasks (concept development, interpreting data, and applying principles).

Another phase incorporated a Likert scale survey which asked the participants to identify those aspects of the program that enhanced their teaching of minority students. The most effective (mean scores of 4.0 or higher) involved: reinforcement, interaction analysis, behavioral objectives, demonstration, audio-tutorial units, lecture with visual aides, and various questioning strategies.

The final phase of the program involved follow-up visits to each participant's college and interviews with immediate supervisors. The follow-up visits confirmed much of the earlier feedback. Participants provided information related to implementing aspects of the program; e.g., improving construction of instructor-made examinations, audio-tutorial units, seminar techniques, behavioral objectives, and benefits obtained from the training in interaction analysis and microteaching.

The participant's immediate supervisor was asked to respond to the following question: "Did the Junior/Community College Institute have a favorable impact upon the participant(s) identified with your department?" The following Likert scale was used for the data: 5 = very strong, 4 = strong, 3 = satisfactory, 2 = weak, 1 = very weak. The mean response was 4.48 with 52% of the supervisors marking the "very strong" category.

The data collected throughout the total program appear to support the conclusion that the training received by the participants contributed to changes in their attitudes, opinions, and behavior related to the effectiveness in teaching. The Delphi process proved particularly valuable in identifying procedures the participants believed to be most beneficial in improving their teaching effectiveness.

The glossary on the next page may provide the reader with information to clarify the terms used to describe the techniques and procedures used during the institute.

GLOSSARY

Microteaching: scaled down lessons of 5-10 minutes in length where the teacher focuses on a specific skill; e.g., probing questions, reinforcement techniques

Interaction Analysis: Flanders' observation system used to record (every three seconds) the verbal interaction between teacher and students within the classroom

Taba's Cognitive Tasks: activities which call for listing, grouping, categorizing, identifying points, explaining items of identified information and making inferences, predicting consequences, explaining and/or supporting the prediction and hypotheses, and verifying the prediction

Assigned Written Report: independent work by the student which is focused by the instructor upon specific requirements of the course

Lecture with Aides: a presentation made by an instructor to give out information or knowledge, as well as summarize or clarify ideas and facts, using various media; e.g., tapes, films, overhead projections

Demonstration: focusing attention on steps and procedures involved in executing various operations

Small Group Discussion: group effort of students to think and reflect collectively about a problem

Assigned Reading: independent study by students which is focused by the instructor upon specific requirements of the course

Individual Projects: independent projects such as reports or creative items which are focused by the instructor upon specific objectives of the course

Behavioral Objectives: a learning outcome which indicates acceptable performance in precise terms

Reinforcement Techniques: an aspect of the instructor's behavior which communicates approval of the student's response or behavior

Questioning Techniques: questions raised by the teacher which require the student to go beyond his first response in order to clarify or justify that response or asking the student to use higher cognitive powers

Audio-Tutorial: instruction by means of audio tapes and visual aids (S. N. Postlethwait's type of program)

LIFE CHANGE AND READING ACHIEVEMENT AS PREDICTORS OF ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE FOR SELECTED COMMUNITY COLLEGE FRESHMEN

Kay Fields Henard, Amarillo College, Amarillo, Texas

Walter F. Stenning, Texas A&M University, College Station, Texas

ABSTRACT

Life change and reading achievement were studied as possible alternatives to traditional entrance examinations in the community college. The Nelson-Denny Reading Test and the Social and Collegiate Readjustment Rating Questionnaire were administered to beginning freshmen in a Texas community college, Amarillo College. Subjects were dichotomized into two (high, low) life stress groups and three (high, moderate, low) reading achievement levels. Academic performance was measured by course hour load, grade point average, and selected attitude factors. Data analysis indicated (1) reading achievement predicted grade point average, course load, and attitudes; (2) life change predicted course load; and (3) there was interaction on course load.

LIFE CHANGE AND READING ACHIEVEMENT AS PREDICTORS OF ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE FOR SELECTED COMMUNITY COLLEGE FRESHMEN

The two-year college has been called the "safety valve of the American educational scheme . . . . the shock absorber for the jarring tensions generated by the victories of mass education and the academic revolution in American life" (Cohen, 1971, pp. 11-12). It serves multiple purposes. It is compre ensive. It offers something for all who attend. It fashions programs to meet the needs of the parent community it serves.

Research indicates that students of the two-year college are viewed dirrently from those of the four-year college. Cross (1969) stated that the community college student typically does not fit the tradition; thus, the measures of his characteristics and his self-development may render him inadequate by comparison with the senior college student.

Academic ability and intelligence prove to be major points of differentiation between two-year and four-year college students. On measures of academic ability and aptitude, including intelligence which was both measured and self-appraised, the two-year student fell below his four-year age-mate (Cooley & Becker, 1966; Astin et al., 1969; Medsker & Tillery, 1971; Cohen, 1971).

Research on the interests of two-year college students may help explain some of the discrepancies found in the academic and intellectual attitudes of two and four-year college students. A survey conducted by the American Council on Education (Astin et al., 1967) as well as the SCOPE study (1968), inquired of two-year and four-year students their "best abilities." The differences in their answers suggested that senior

college students feel most confident in their academic and verbal abilities, whereas junior college students perceive their talents in the non-academic realm.

The acknowledged interests and perceived abilities of two-year students may have had a strong bearing on the finding by Knoell and Medsker (1964) that junior college students tend to major in the applied fields or on the suggestion by Cooley and Becker (1966) that two-year students have a more practical orientation to college and to life than do their counterparts in four-year colleges. Other differentiations find the two-year student lower on the socioeconomic scale (Astin et al., 1967; Cooley & Becker, 1966) and more likely to be a part-time student due to full- or part-time employment (Cross, 1968; U.S. Census, 1970).

All of these factors and others ultimately influence the academic performance of the two-year college student. The effects of these factors tend to maximize the ratio of potential to actual enrollment and graduation levels in two-year colleges.

Ridlon (1961, p. 56) emphasized "the relationship of good reading skills to success in college is primary." In numerous studies, the Nelson-Denny Reading Test (Brown, 1973) has been positively correlated with grade point average (Blai, 1970, 1971; Freer, 1968). The results of Blai's (1970, p. 1) study supported the hypothesis that "reading plays a vital role in student achievement of academic success." Some studies also suggest that reading skills are influenced by attitudes and personality characteristics (Spache, 1961, 1963; McDonald, 1964; Brunkan and Shen, 1966; Maxwell, 1971). However, research on college reading achievement, especially that of community junior college students, is limited. Further studies are needed to promote conclusive results.

Feldman and Newcomb (1970) pointed out that a healthy adjustment to college life depends upon such nonintellectual characteristics as ability to cope with stress and anxiety as well as psychological readiness. "Life stress" as explained by Gunderson in Gunderson and Rahe (1974) is the broad area of research concerned with the events in daily living which effect susceptibility to negative physiological or psychological changes. Selye (1974, p. 27) defined stress as "the nonspecific response of the body to any demand made upon it."

A variety of studies in a variety of settings lend credence to the idea that stress and change are interwined. The life change theory is an outgrowth of the emphasis upon rate of change as the most important stress producing factor. Thomas H. Holmes, professor of psychiatry at the University of Washington, is among the chief researchers in the field of psychosomatic medicine and the life change theory. Holmes and his associates (1973) have relied upon the belief of Selye and others that a major change, either pleasant or unpleasant, requires a person to make some adjustment. Furthermore, his research has indicated that too many changes, coming too close together, can relate to the onset of illness or deep depression. After gathering extensive case history data over a twenty year period, Holmes and his associates compiled 43 life events which seemed to elicit change from the patient into a self-report inventory. They quantified through quasi-experimental research the amount of change in life adjustment that was necessary to adapt to the 43 specified life events. The self-report instrument was published by Holmes and Rahe (1967) under the title "Social Readjustment Rating Questionnaire." It has found numerous purposes.

Studies indicated that the amount of life change categorizes a person as low, medium, or high risk in his susceptibility to phenomena such as illness (Rahe, Meyer, Smith, Kjaer & Holmes, 1964; Holmes & Masuda, 1973; Rahe & Lind, 1971; Tollefson, 1972: Wold, 1968; Rahe, Mahan, Arthur & Gunderson, 1970), depression (Brown & Birley, 1968; Paykel in Gunderson & Rahe, 1974), anxiety (Lauer, 1973, 1974), minor health changes (Holmes & Holmes, 1970), and injury (Bramwell, 1971). College academic performance has also been examined in relation to life change (Harris, 1972; Henard, 1975). There was discrepancy in the findings of both studies. Harris found that the more life changes a subject had recently experienced, the lower was his grade point average. These findings were significant at the .05 and .01 levels for the low life change and high life change groups respectively. Henard's study found life stress to be influential at the .002 significance level upon college students only in terms of the number of semester hours that could be successfully completed. Grade point averages proved to be an insufficient correlate of life change.

Life change research by Holmes, Rahe, Masuda, Gunderson, and others involves an ongoing effort to quantify and qualify life events as they occur under the vice of Toffler's (1970) "future shock." These researchers have found that life change stresses trigger physiological and psychological reactions which could be detrimental to one's health and welfare. It is on the basis of their relatively new research that life change is considered a possible force to be reckoned with in the lives of two-year college freshmen even though studies are yet very limited which relate this phenomenon to the experiences of the college student.

This study investigated possible alternatives to traditional entrance examinations which might be used by the "open door" two-year college to assess diverse academic abilities and needs. The purpose of this research was to determine if life change as assessed by the Social and Collegiate Readjustment Rating Questionnaire (SCRRQ) and reading achievement as measured by the Nelson-Denny Reading Test (NDRT) could be utilized as predictors of academic performance for selected community college freshmen. Academic performance was measured by course hour loads completed during the first and second semesters, and attitudes expressed concerning academic, personal, social, and career goals. Attitudes were assessed by an original Attitude Survey. The ultimate goal of this study was to predict potential academic success accurately, so that a relevant program of study might be prescribed to alleviate weaknesses and build strengths and interests to the point where the student is satisfied with both his college achievement and his career potential.

Methodology

The sample was selected from the sub-population of 326 beginning freshman students enrolled in the academic curriculum of an accredited two-year comprehensive community college in Northwest Texas, Amarillo College. In late August, 1974, 403 beginning community college freshmen were administered the Nelson-Denny Reading Test (NDRT) to assess reading achievement. In the last week of April, 1975, all (N=326) of those students who had taken the Nelson-Denny and had remained in college for the Spring Semester of 1975 were mailed a packet containing the following instruments: (1) a cover letter explaining the study and encouraging response, (2) a demographic data questionnaire, (3) a Social and Collegiate Readjustment Rating Questionnaire (SCRRQ), and (4) an Attitude Survey.

By early May, 1975, one-hundred and seventy-two (53%) had returned the questionnaire packet. Of this number 117 were selected for inclusion as subjects.

The only restriction placed on the sampling procedure, aside from the fact that the subjects volunteered, were efforts to achieve an equal porportion in each of six groups. The subjects were dichotomized into one of two life change groups (high risk or low risk) according to the life change unit accumulation assessed by the SCRRQ. The subjects were also classified into one of three reading groups (high, moderate, or low) according to a composite vocabulary and comprehension score on the NDRT. There were 20 subjects in each of the five groups and 17 subjects in one group.

The following dependent measures were then identified for each of the respondents: (1) first semester (fall, 1974) course hour load completed, (2) first semester grade point average earned, (3) second semester (spring, 1975) course hour load completed, (4) second semester grade point average earned, (5) composite grade point average earned, and (6) attitude variables as measured by an Attitude Survey developed and validated by the investigator to assess personal, social, academic, and career perceptions.

Data were subjected to descriptive analysis and were then exposed to a two-by-three factorial analysis of variance to determine significant differences in the six groups on the variables in question. Multivariate analysis distinguished significant item differentiations on the Attitude Survey between the six groups. In a supplemental study, an intercorrelation analysis was executed on selected variables.

Results and Conclusions

As indicated in Table 1, reading achievement interacted significantly with each of the six dependent measures of academic performance: fall and spring course hour load, fall, spring and composite grade point average; and selected attitude variables. In fact, reading achievement was most significant as a main effects measure on initial course hour load and initial semester grade point average. These findings substantiated the notion that reading achievement was an accurate predictor of academic performance, especially in the initial semester of college. It can be concluded that reading achievement is a determinant of potential academic performance when measured by course hours completed, grades made, and attitudes expressed.

A multivariate analysis determined the significance of 44 attitude factors in relation to reading achievement. Personal perspectives such as loneliness and disappointment were significant due to the differentiation between the high and low achievement levels on these attitudes. While high and moderate levels tended to disagree that they were lonely, low achievers in reading tended to agree. Low achievers also showed more tendency toward feelings of disappointment in life. Interestingly, the moderate achievers in reading seemed most content with life in view of the disappointments it held. Academically related attitudes produced differing results. High achievers in reading were less likely to agree that college helped one think for himself, that self-paced classes were helpful, or that participation in class discussions was embarrassing. It can be concluded that reading achievement related to attitudes in determining academic success.

TABLE 1

Analyses of Reading Achievement by Descriptive Statistics and Analysis of Variance

Dependent Variables	Reading Achievement							
	High (n = 40)		Moderate (n=40)		Low (n = 37)			
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	F-Ratio	P
Fall Course Hour Load	14.08	2.48	13.50	3.14	10.59	4.06	13.52	.0001
Fall Grade Point Average	3.08	.66	2.73	.70	2.41	.83	7.70	.0011
Spring Course Hour Load	13.55	3.64	13.31	3.07	11.17	3.72	4.83	.0099
Spring Grade Point Average	3.04	.69	2.78	.67	2.57	.65	4.57	.0148
Composite Grade Point Average	3.04	.62	2.74	.65	2.62	.62	4.24	.0168

Table 2 displays the main effects of life change on the six dependent variables including course hour loads, grade point averages, and selected attitude factors. Being in the high or low risk life change category caused significant differentiation on only one variable, spring course hour load. High risk subjects completed less course hours than did low risk subjects. A similar trend was evident in the fall semester but not to a significant degree. It can be concluded that life change is not a determinant of academic performance in terms of grade point averages or attitudes. However, the course hour load which a subject was able to complete tended to reflect upon the life stress he was experiencing due to life change.

Table 3 indicates the significant interaction between the levels of reading achievement and the categories of life change as they influenced course hour loads and grade point averages. Results indicated that the grade point averages for the first academic year were unrelated to the interaction effects of reading achievement and life change. However, the initial semester course hour load was significantly influenced by these interaction effects. Low risk, low reading ability subjects completed significantly fewer course hours. It can be concluded from this finding that when reading achievement was measured in conjunction with life change measurement on the subjects, a predictor of course hour capacity evolved. This interaction implies the impact of college work on the beginning student. The strongest recommendation that can be created from this interaction is focused on a matrix in Table 4 that was developed to make applicable the results of this research. It organizes possible

TABLE 2

Analysis of Life Change by Descriptive Statistics and Analysis of Variance

Dependent Variables	Life Change					
	High Risk (n=60)		Low Risk (n=57)			
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	F-Ratio	P
Fall Course Hour Load	12.19	3.48	13.35	3.62	2.81	.09
Fall Grade Point Average	2.68	.80	2.82	,75	.95	.67
Spring Course Hour Load	11.73	4.19	13.94	2.37	10.06	.002
Spring Grade Point Average	2.79	.70	2.85	.69	.20	.66
Composite Grade Point Average	2.78	.65	2.86	.65	.20	.66

TABLE 3

Interaction of Life Change by Reading Achievement on Descriptive Statistics and Analysis of Variance

	Life Change by Reading Achievement													
	Group I		Group II		Group III		Group IV		Group V		Group VI		F-Ratio	P
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
Fall Course Hour Load	13.25	2.8	12.11	3.8	11.2	3.6	14.9	1.9	14.75	1.6	9.88	4.51	4.05	.02
Fall Grade Point Average	3.11	.62	2.5	.77	2.38	.85	3.04	.72	2.93	.59	2.45	.84	1.08	.34
Spring Course Hour Load	12.50	4.56	12.11	3.6	10.41	4.2	14.6	2.04	14.45	1.85	12.15	2.79	.07	.93
Spring Grade Point Average	2.96	.75	2.76	.70	2.61	.62	3.11	.63	2.81	.66	2.51	.70	.34	.72
Composite Grade Point Average	3.02	.59	2.62	.71	2.67	.59	3.07	.66	2.86	.58	2.55	.68	.73	.51

TABLE 4

Matrix of Suggested Curricula Based on Student Needs as Measured by Life Change and Reading Achievement

LIFE CHANGE	READING ACHIEVEMENT: High (NDRT Score: 80 or above)	Moderate (NDRT Score: 59-79)	Low (NDRT Score: below 59)
High (SCRRQ Score: 300 LCU or above)	1. Traditional college coursework 2. Not more than 12-15 credit hours per semester 3. Humanistic psychology course or group counseling	1. Traditional college coursework 2. Reading techniques course 3. Not more than 12 credit hours per semester 4. Developmental courses in any weak subject areas 5. Humanistic psychology course or group counseling	1. Developmental courses in all weak subject areas 2. Reading techniques course 3. Not more than 12 credit hours per semester 4. Humanistic psychology course or group counseling
Low (SCRRQ Score: below 300 LCU)	1. Traditional college coursework 2. 15 or more credit hours per semester if desired	1. Traditional college coursework 2. Reading techniques course 3. Not more than 12-15 credit hours per semester 4. Developmental courses in any weak subject areas	1. Developmental courses in all weak subject areas 2. Reading techniques course 3. Not more than 12 credit hours per semester 4. Humanistic psychology course or group counseling

indicators which counselors, advisors, and instructors can use as a quick profile reference of the entering freshman from which guidance could be offered with regard to individual curricular needs. Currently the matrix is subject to revision pending needed additional research and implementation.

It was concluded on the basis of results that: (1) reading achievement is an effective predictor of grade point average, course hour load, and selected attitude factors; (2) life change predicts only course hour load effectively; and (3) the interaction of reading achievement and life change is significant only as a predictor of course hour load.

Based on the conclusions of this research, it is recommended that: (1) the study be replicated on a larger scale in different locales with both two-year and four-year college freshmen; (2) two year colleges consider utilizing reading achievement as an effective predictor of academic performance for incoming freshmen; and (3) further research be conducted to determine the effects of life change on the academic performance of community college freshmen.

REFERENCES

Astin, A. W., & Panos, R. J. The educational and vocational development of college dropouts. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1969.

Astin, A. W., Panos, R. J., & Creager, J. A. National norms for entering college freshmen - Fall 1966. (ACE research reports, vol. 2, no. 6). Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1967.

Blai, B. Interpreting Nelson-Denny Reading Test scores. 1970 (ERIC ED 057 088).

Blai, B. Nelson-Denny Reading Test and Harcum-earned academic averages. 1971 (ERIC ED 057 089).

Bramwell, S. T. Personality and psychosocial variables in college athletes. Unpublished medical thesis, University of Washington, 1971.

Brown, G. W. & Birley, J. Crises and life changes at the onset of schizophrenia. Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 1968, 9, 203-209.

Brown, J. I. Nelson-Denny Reading Test, Form C. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1973.

Brunkan, R. J. & Shen, F. Personality characteristics of ineffective, effective, and efficient readers. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1966, 4, 837-843.

Cohen, A. M. A constant variable. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1971.

Cooley, W. W., & Becker, S. J. The junior college student. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1966, 1, 464-469.

Cross, K. P. The junior college student: A research description. Princeton, N. J.: Educational Testing Service, 1968.

Cross, K. P. Higher education's newest student. In Proceedings of Western Regional Conference on Testing Problems. Princeton, N. J.: Educational Testing Service, 1969.

Feldman, K. A., & Newcomb, T. M. The impact of college on students: I. An analysis of four decades of research. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1970.

Freer, I. A study of the effect of a college reading program upon the grade point averages in Odessa College, Odessa, Texas. 1968 (ERIC ED 082 158).

Gunderson, E. K. E. Introduction. In E. K. E. Gunderson & R. H. Rahe (Eds.), Life stress and illness. Springfield, Ill.: Charles C. Thomas, 1974.

Harris, P. W. The relationship of life change to academic performance among selected college freshmen at varying levels of college readiness. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, East Texas State University, 1972.

Henard, K. F. Life change and reading achievement as predictors of academic performance for selected community college freshmen. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Texas A&M University, 1975.

Holmes, T. H., & Masuda, M. Life change and illness susceptibility. In J. P. Scott & E. C. Senay (eds.), Separation and depression: Clinical and research aspects. Washington, D. C.: American Association for Advancement of Science, 1973.

Holmes, T. H., & Rahe, R. H. The Social Readjustment Rating Scale. Journal of Psychosomatic Research, 1967, 11, 213-218.

Holmes, T. S., & Holmes, T. H. Short term intrusions into the life style routine. Journal of Psychosomatic Research, 1970, 14, 121-132.

Knoell, D. M., & Medsker, L.L. Articulation between two-year and four-year colleges. Berkeley: Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, University of California, 1964.

Lauer, R. H. The social readjustment scale and anxiety: A cross-cultural study. Journal of Psychosomatic Research, 1973, 17, 171-174.

Lauer, R. H. Rate of change and stress: A test of the "future shock" thesis. Social Forces, 1974, 52, 510-516.

Maxwell, M. J. The role of attitudes and emotions in changing reading and study skills behavior of college students. Journal of Reading, 1971, 14, 359-364, 420-422.

McDonald, A. S. Intellectual characteristics of disabled readers at the high school and college levels. Journal of Developmental Reading, 1964, 7, 97-101.

Medsker, L.L., & Tillery, D. Breaking the access barriers: A profile of two-year colleges. New York: McGraw Hill, 1971.

Paykel, E. S. Recent life events and clinical depressions. In E. K. E. Gunderson & R. H. Rahe (Eds.), Life stress and illness. Springfield, Ill.: Charles C. Thomas, 1974.

Rahe, R. H., & Lind, E. Psychosocial factors and sudden cardiac death: A pilot study. Journal of Psychosomatic Research, 1971, 15, 19-24.

Rahe, R. H., Mahan, J., Arthur, R. J., & Gunderson, E. K. E. Epidemiology of illness in naval environments: I. Illness types, distribution, severities, and relationship to life change. Military Medicine, 1970, 135, 443-452.

Rahe, R. H., Meyer, H., Smith, M., Kjaer, G., & Holmes, T. H. Social stress and illness onset. Journal of Psychosomatic Research, 1964, 8, 35-42.

Ridlon, H. G. Why freshmen fail. Atlantic Monthly, 1961, 208, 56-60.

Sanford, N. Where colleges fail. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1967.

SCOPE, School to college: Opportunities for post-secondary education. Unpublished data from Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, University of California, Berkeley, 1968.

Selye, H. Stress without distress. New York: J. P. Lippincott Co., 1974.

Spache, G. D. Research in reading at the University of Florida, 1950-1960. In E. P. Bleismer & A. J. Kingston (Eds.), Tenth yearbook of the National Reading Conference. Milwaukee: National Reading Conference, 1961.

Spache, G. D. Toward better reading. Champaign, Ill:: Garrard Publishing Co., 1963.

Toffler, A. Future Shock. New York: Random House, 1970

Tollefson, D. J. The relationship between the occurrence of fractures and life crises events. Unpublished Master of Nursing thesis, University of Washington, 1972.

United States Bureau of the Census. Current Population Reports, Series p-20, Number 231. Undergraduate enrollment in two-year and four-year colleges: October, 1970. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office.

Wold, D. A. The adjustment of siblings to childhood leukemia. Unpublished medical thesis, University of Washington, 1968.

LOCAL TAX AUTHORIZATION AND COMMUNITY COLLEGE STATUS: A STUDY OF ADAPTATION

Publication No. _____

Roy Conrado Rodriguez, Ph.D.
The University of Texas at Austin, 1976

Supervising Professor: L. D. Haskew

Cast in a framework of organization-to-environment interactions, the investigation sought to elucidate the responses of three community college organizations to an environment in which fiscal support from local taxation was lacking. The three community college districts, labeled "Divergent," were located in three major cities of Texas. A companion set of three districts, labeled "Standard" because they did have local taxation, was used to furnish reference criterions for status. To identify the data to be secured, parameters for college operations were constructed. A set of indexing behaviors for each parameter was formulated and indicators for those behaviors were selected. "Objective" data were derived from reports on file with the Coordinating Board, Texas Colleges and University System, and individual college data banks. "Subjective" data were drawn from opinions and responses by district officials to a structured interview guide. Interviews examined four territories:

Caliber of District Programs and Services, Characteristics of District Physical Plant, Psychological Support by District Citizens, and Prospects for District Status in the next decade.

Five research questions, used in lieu of hypotheses, were propounded: (1) Is it possible to operate visible and adequate community colleges without supplementing present State funding with revenues from local district taxes? (2) As the Divergent organizations interacted with their task-environments, what administrative responses were made to fiscal and operational duress? (3) What relationships appear to exist between presence/absence of local funding and: innovativeness and expansiveness, organizational morale, a supportive citizenry, and achievements of requisite quality in outputs? (4) Do the programmatic accomplishments in Divergent districts match "standard" expectations? (5) What, in 1975, are seen as the prospects for the Divergent districts to continue as comprehensive community colleges?

Findings. Objective and subjective data regarding the "adequacy" and "viability" of the Divergent districts indicated all three were comprehensive in nature and provided reasonably adequate programs and services. However, the continued viability of the districts was questionable. While continued operation at present levels could be foreseen, frustrations were mounting and flow of requisite fiscal support was not presently in sight. Three varieties of administrative adaptations to duress were found. One was the acquisition of some replacement funding and loaned

physical facilities to compensate for lack of local funding. The second was to sacrifice certain orthodox program features. A third was to economize, below orthodoxy, in gross expenditures for professional salaries. Co-relations were found between the lack of local funding and (a) innovativeness and expansion of programs and services and (b) decline of organizational morale. No co-relations existed between lack of local funding and (a) psychological support by district citizens and (b) attainment of requisite quality in programs and services. Divergent districts met "standard" expectations in vocational-technical, transfer, and disadvantaged-serving programs. Adult and continuing education, student personnel services, Learning Resources, and instructional support programs were below "standards" for a comprehensive community college. Interviewees perceived future prospects (1975-85) for Standard districts as "excellent." Divergent district interviewees perceived prospects for their districts as "questionable." Apprehension was voiced about (a) reliability of funding flow from foreseen available sources, and (b) continued availability and usage of most existing physical facilities. Most saw local taxation as necessary for adequate attainments.

Abstract*

Competencies for Junior/Community College Teachers

by

Dr. Sheila C. Tesar

Competency statements in seven different areas related to community college instruction were assessed by participants of a study sponsored by the Community College Teaching Intern Program during November and December, 1975. Questionnaires containing forty competency statements were sent to instructional administrators (deans or equivalent titles) in each of the forty-seven community college districts in Texas. Forty-eight responses, from forty-four community college districts were obtained providing a 92% response rate.

The purpose of the study was to assess the importance of competencies in the areas of:

1. Instructional methods
2. Assessment and evaluation
3. Curriculum development
4. Motivation
5. Interpersonal relations
6. Organization
7. Administration

Respondents were asked to rank statements in each area as follows:

4 - essential

3 - important

2 - not essential

1 - unnecessary

*Expected competion date of comprehensive data analysis - June 1, 1976.

The questionnaire was divided to obtain responses on each item for both academic and vocational/technical teachers.

Results:

1. There was no significant difference between responses to competencies for vocational/technical instructors and responses for academic instructors.

2. Junior community college administrators ranked organizational and administrative competencies highest for both academic and vocational/technical instructors.

3. No category of competencies received a mean rating of less than 3.0, "important."

4. Three individual competency statements for academic teachers received mean ratings of less than 3.0. They are:

1.c. - To construct and use preassessments - $\overline{M}$ = 2.958

2.c. - To provide alternate tests for those who fail to master the material on the first opportunity - $\overline{M}$ = 2.957

2.e. - To test for all levels of achievement, including higher levels such as analysis, synthesis and problem solving skills - $\overline{M}$ = 2.595

5. Two competency statements received a mean rating of less than 3.0 for vocational/technical faculty. They are:

2.d.(1) - To employ a variety of assessment techniques, including written exams - objective - $\overline{M}$ = 2.867

2.e. - To test for all levels of achievement, including higher levels such as analysis, synthesis and problem solving skills - $\overline{M}$ = 2.829

Mean ranks for each category of competencies are shown below:

Categories of Competencies for Academic Instructors

Category	Mean
1. Organization	3.594
2. Administration	3.574
3. Curriculum Development	3.424
4. Motivation	3.248
5. Interpersonal relations	3.248
6. Instructional methods	3.245
7. Assessment	3.174

Categories of Competencies for Vocational/Technical Instructors

Category	Mean
1. Organization	3.655
2. Administration	3.610
3. Curriculum development	3.535
4. Motivation	3.455
5. Instructional methods	3.427
6. Assessment	3.376
7. Interpersonal relations	3.274

Summary and Conclusion

Junior/community college administrators place high priority on possession of organizational and administrative skills by their instructional staff. This focus may stem from experience in working with alternate instructional modes, which require greater attention to organization and

time management than does traditional classroom teaching. High ranks for administrative skills may also reflect the administrators' desire to observe demonstrated commitment to the institution as a whole in addition to instructional commitments. This possibility was mentioned in several comments indicating satisfaction that the two elements included - organization and administration - are generally not addressed in any teacher preparation program, but are essential to successful integration of the teacher in the implementation of the overall goals of the institution.

The low responses for competencies in assessment and evaluation are difficult to analyze. Why would testing for all levels of achievement not be a high priority? What reasons do administrators have for wanting teachers to test only for basic knowledge? And why aren't pre-assessments (or finding out entry level skills of students as a guide to organizing instruction) considered important? Adding to this the low score for re-testing those who fail on the first try gives a composite picture of administrators basically uncertain regarding a non-punitive attitude toward evaluation. This attitude should be explored further to clarify components on evaluation and assessment which should be included in a teacher training curriculum.

Mean responses for the other categories are almost too close to place in rank order, indicating that about equal priority is placed on curriculum development, instructional methods, motivation and interpersonal relations. All categories are within the "important" ranks.

Junior/community college instructional administrators generally have major, if not definitive input, into the hiring of new faculty. They are furthermore responsible for supervision, for faculty development, and for

performance evaluation. For these reasons their inputs from the field should be heeded in the development of curriculum for a program designed to train prospective community college instructors. Responses from this study have validated attention being devoted to four areas: curriculum development, instructional methods, motivation and interpersonal relations. Results suggest a need for futher exploration of evaluation and assessment techniques. Furthermore, increased attention during the preparation sequence appears to be warranted for developing competencies in organization and administrative skills for instructors.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

AUG 13 1976

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGES